

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CHARLES L. BOBO,)
Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C13-0849-JCC
v.)
PLYMOUTH HOUSING GROUP) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
HUMPHREY HOUSE,)
Defendant.)

Plaintiff Charles L. Bobo, proceeding *pro se*, submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) and a proposed complaint to this Court for review. (Dkt. 1.) Plaintiff brings his claims against Plymouth Housing Group Humphrey House and describes his complaint as follows: “Visitor come to your room 6 times[.] No excessive foot traffic allowed short period of time each time specifically between the hours of 5:00 am – 7:00 am[.] Visitor come your room 6 time (sic).” (Dkt. 1-1 at 2.) Plaintiff alleges the basis for jurisdiction as “Monitor hallway elevator and around building.” (*Id.*)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the district court must dismiss a case “at any time” it

01 determines a complaint is frivolous or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. §
02 1915(e)(2)(B). Section 1915(e) applies to all IFP proceedings, not just those filed by
03 prisoners. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000).

04 A review of the Court's filing system reveals that plaintiff has filed some twenty-nine
05 different actions in this Court. See *Bobo v. Tracfone Wireless Inc.*, C13-884-JCC (Dkt. 2).
06 The Court dismissed a number of those cases upon finding that plaintiff failed to state a claim
07 upon which relief could be granted, that the filing was frivolous, and/or that the Court lacked
08 jurisdiction. See, e.g., *Bobo v. Tracfone Wireless, Inc.*, C13-071-MJP (Dkts. 3-5); *Bobo v.*
09 *DSHS*, C12-1992-RAJ (Dkt. 6); *Bobo v. Tulane County District Attorney*, C12-1805-RSL
10 (Dkts. 3-5). See also *Bobo v. Plymouth Housing Group Humphrey House*, C12-2071-MJP
11 (Dkt. 10) (similar claims raised against the same defendant named in this action dismissed for
12 failure to prosecute).

13 As in those prior cases, plaintiff here fails to set forth facts sufficient to state a
14 cognizable claim against the defendant, fails to set forth any basis for jurisdiction in this Court,
15 and submits a complaint that appears frivolous on its face. Accordingly, the Court
16 recommends that plaintiff's IFP application be STRICKEN and this matter DISMISSED with
17 prejudice. A proposed Order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

18 DATED this 22nd day of May, 2013.

19
20 
21 Mary Alice Theiler
United States Magistrate Judge
22